LAW OFFICES
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
700 THIRTEENTH ST., N.W., SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3960

TELEPHONE: (202) 737-6770 FACSIMILE: (202) 737-6776

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: OCTOBER 7, 2003

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET): 3

OUR REFERENCE: 400966

FROM: JEFFREY A. WYAND
REGISTRATION NO. 29,458

EXTENSION NO.: 219

TO: EXAMINER THOMPSON
GROUP 2825
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 703-305-7441
FACSIMILE NUMBER: 703-746-4112

IN RE APPLN. OF:	FURUMOTO ET AL.
SERIAL NO.	09/729,088
FILED:	DECEMBER 5, 2000
FOR:	METHOD OF DESIGNING A SEMICONDUCTOR CIRCUIT WITH REDUCED CLOCK LINE SKEW
GROUP ART UNIT:	2825
EXAMINER:	THOMPSON

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 400966

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

FURUMOTO et al.

Application No. 09/729,088 Art Unit: 2825

Filed: December 5, 2000 Examiner: A. Thompson

For: METHOD OF DESIGNING A SEMICONDUCTOR CIRCUIT WITH REDUCED CLOCK LINE SKEW

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 4, 2003, Applicants respectfully request an interview with the Examiner. Applicants request the interview to accomplish the following:

- Understand the Examiner's position that delay gate movement necessitates deletion and reinsertion. By our understanding of computer automated design, data structures implementing delay gates are moved by instantaneously changing the X-Y coordinates of the data structure. Accordingly, the delay gate data structure is never absent from the circuit design. Therefore, we do not understand the Examiner's basis for the contention that delay gate movement inherently involves deletion.
- Ascertain the Examiner's response to arguments made by Applicants in the Amendment of March 21, 2003, to which the Examiner did not respond in the Official Action of June 4, 2003. Namely, Applicants argued that the alleged teaching of delay gate deletion in Li occurs before routing, not after routing as recited in the present claims. The Examiner made no rebuttal to Applicants contention.
- Ascertain the Examiner's view as to what amendments are necessary to bring the application into a form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: October 8, 2003